



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,747	04/21/2004	Taylor J. Leaming	02-AU-089 (52039)	5486

7590 05/17/2007
Mario Donato, Jr.
STMicroelectronics, Inc.
1310 Electronics Dr.
Carrollton, TX 75006

EXAMINER

CAPUTO, LISA M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2876

MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE

05/17/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/828,747	Applicant(s) LEAMING, TAYLOR J.	
	Examiner Lisa M. Caputo	Art Unit 2876	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 11, 21 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-10, 12-20, 22-30, 32-38 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 July 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the amendment filed 27 February 2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maier (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0251596) in view of Tello (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,537).

Regarding claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, Maier teaches an integrated circuit for a smart card comprising a transceiver and a processor (smart card) for communication with a host (personal computer PC) via the transceiver and performing a plurality of smart card applications, said processor for cooperating with the host device to perform an enumeration (ENUM1) based upon at least one default descriptor (descriptors I) (see Figure 1, paragraphs 38-44).

Although Maier teaches of an active memory to which drivers are loaded, Maier fails to teach the step of generating a look-up table for allocating data to respective smart card applications based on the enumeration, and detecting a system event, and responsive to the system event, cooperating with the host device to perform a new

Art Unit: 2876

enumeration based upon at least one alternate descriptor and generating a new look-up table thereon.

Tello teaches a computer security system which utilizes an encrypted table of smart card code numbers are also stored in the flash memory of the security engine. This table is used during the operation of the invention to identify the purpose and type of smart card inserted in the smart card reader which is logically connected to the security engine (see col 9, lines 26-31). Hence, Tello teaches the use of a look-up table which stores smart card information during smart card processes.

In view of the teaching of Tello, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a look-up table, and subsequent look-up tables because it is favorable to be able to obtain information and be able to access it at a later time.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 2-10, 12-20, 22-30, and 32-38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The best prior art of record fails to specifically teach the subsequent steps of the data placement in the look-up table (i.e. applications with their associated endpoints, and alternate descriptors in the form of device, configuration or interface descriptors).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 27 February 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

6. In response to applicant's arguments that the combination of Maier and Tello do not teach the present invention as claimed, examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Maier teaches the integrated circuit basis for the invention, and Tello teaches the deficiency of Maier, which is the generation of the look-up table. It is favorable to combine these references since they both teach of utilizing smart cards for obtaining and using data.

In response to applicant's argument that the "encrypted table of smart card code numbers" of Tello is not a look-up table for allocating data to respective smart card applications, examiner disagrees and respectfully submits that, as claimed, Tello does indeed teach the look-up table since Tello teaches that smart card code numbers are stored in a table that is able to be accessed (i.e. looked up) during the operation of the invention to identify the purpose and type of smart card inserted into the smart card reader. It is respectfully submitted that in Tello, the enumeration occurs when the smart card is inserted into the smart card reader, which calls up (i.e. generates) the look-up table.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Lisa M. Caputo** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2388**. The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 8:30AM to 5:00PM Monday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached at **(571) 272-2398**. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [**lisa.caputo@uspto.gov**].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lisa M. Caputo
AU 2876
May 12, 2007


LISA CAPUTO
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER